





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/915,835	07/26/2001	Thomas J. Wielenga	60,472-003	7214
7590 03/09/2004		EXAMINER		
William H. Honaker			FLEMING, FAYE M	
	IOWARD ATTORNEY rd Avenue, Suite 101	S, P.C.	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-2856			3616	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/915,835	WIELENGA, THOMAS J.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
امنو	•	Faye Fleming	3616			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLIMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replication of the provision of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		,				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 D	December 2003.	·			
	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, pi	rosecution as to the merits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
ŕ	Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,6,8-16,24-28,30-33 and 45-59</u> is 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,6,12-16,24-28,45-48 and 53-55</u> Claim(s) <u>8-11,30-33,49-52 and 56-59</u> is/are re Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration. is/are allowed. jected.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The specification is objected to be specification.	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage			
Attachmen	nt(s)	_				
2)	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/915,835

Art Unit: 3616

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 8, 9, 30, 31, 49, 50, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faye (6,105,705) in view of Tozu, et al (5,927,830) and further in view of Dai (4,934,477).

Faye teaches a system for use with a motor vehicle having at least one front wheel and at least one rear wheel having a brake system 14 for applying pressure to resist the rotation of the at least one front wheel and/or the at least one rear wheel; a sensor for detecting an occurrence of a collision and/or a loss of control event of the motor vehicle and producing a loss of control signal; and a controller 10. The collision is a non-rear end collision. The controller controls the brake system to apply pressure to one of all of the front wheels, one of the front wheels, and all of the front wheels and all of the rear wheels in response to receiving the loss of control signal. The sensor is an accelerometer (see Col. 3, lines 35-37). The sensor is included in an airbag system (see Col. 3, lines 50-52). The airbag system is an energy absorbing structure. Faye in view of Tozu, et al teaches the claimed invention except for reducing a power output of the engine. Dai teaches a microprocessor 100 which functions to restrict the fuel supply, reducing a power output of the engine (see Col. 3, lines 65-68). Based on the teachings of Dai, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Faye and Tozu, et al to reduce a power output of the engine to facilitate deceleration of a vehicle upon crashing.

Application/Control Number: 09/915,835

Art Unit: 3616

3. Claims 8-11, 30-33, 49-52 and 56-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faye (6,105,705) in view of Tozu, et al (5,927,830) and further in view of Doi (5,805,103).

Faye teaches a system for use with a motor vehicle having at least one front wheel and at least one rear wheel having a brake system 14 for applying pressure to resist the rotation of the at least one front wheel and/or the at least one rear wheel; a sensor for detecting an occurrence of a collision and/or a loss of control event of the motor vehicle and producing a loss of control signal; and a controller 10. The collision is a non-rear end collision. The controller controls the brake system to apply pressure to one of all of the front wheels, one of the front wheels, and all of the front wheels and all of the rear wheels in response to receiving the loss of control signal. The sensor is an accelerometer (see Col. 3, lines 35-37). The sensor is included in an airbag system (see Col. 3, lines 50-52). The airbag system is an energy absorbing structure. Faye in view of Tozu, et al teaches the claimed invention except for reducing a power output of the engine. Doi teaches a control unit U having a cruise control function and is capable of controlling an engine output control means 6 (see Col. 4, lines 40-46). Based on the teachings of Doi, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Faye and Tozu, et al to reduce a power output of the engine to facilitate deceleration of a vehicle upon crashing.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12-16, 24-28, 45-48 and 53-55 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed December 18, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the prior art "only detects a collision", the examiner notes that a collision is a result in an abrupt change of momentum or exchange of energy therefore the term collision does not preclude a loss of control. Further, the references clearly teaches the claimed structure.

Art Unit: 3616

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy 6. as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faye Fleming whose telephone number is (703) 305-0209. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on (703) 308-2089. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600